Eternity Against Reality; God, the Entropic Epitome of Symbolic Lock-In

Benjamin James

August 13, 2025

Across human history, the symbol of God has occupied a position unlike any other in the architecture of meaning. Political orders rise and fall, languages mutate, scientific paradigms overturn, yet the symbol of God persists across these changes with a peculiar immunity to revision. This persistence is not simply a function of devotional feeling or metaphysical speculation. It emerges from the structural properties of "God" as a symbolic form. A form that can be understood, without making any theological commitments, as the most powerful symbolic lock-in attractor in the repertoire of human culture. To grasp this is to see why God has been both the generative source of profound civilizations and the central mechanism by which human systems close themselves against the adaptive flow of reality.

In its most general sense, the symbol of God operates as the terminal point in the hierarchy of justification. In any symbolic order, whether political, scientific, or cultural, statements and norms derive legitimacy from higher-order referents. A law gains authority by reference to a constitution; the constitution gains authority from a theory of sovereignty; sovereignty may itself be justified by a social contract or a historical tradition. But in the God-referent, this chain stops. God, conceived of as the infinite and ultimate, is defined as beyond appeal. There is no higher symbol, no deeper authority. This terminus grants the symbol extraordinary stability. It is not merely one node in the network of meaning, but the point at which the network claims to touch the absolute.

Such terminality would be potent enough, but God as symbol also possesses an additional structural property; it is defined as eternal, unchanging, and self-consistent. Unlike a constitution, which may contain amendment clauses, or a scientific theory, which is in principle open to falsification, the God-symbol is framed as immune to revision. Any apparent contradiction is not a flaw in the symbol but a flaw in human perception or interpretation. This asymmetry is crucial. In most symbolic systems, sustained misalignment with reality generates pressure for reform. In a God-centered symbolic order,

misalignment produces no such pressure; instead, reality itself is reinterpreted until it fits the symbolic frame. The result is a near-perfect stability basin in which the symbol can persist indefinitely regardless of external change.

The God-symbol also functions as a universal compression device. It can subsume and unify diverse domains of meaning, from cosmology and morality to law, causation, and purpose, under a single referent. In doing so, it dramatically reduces the cognitive and social complexity of the system. Where multiple, potentially conflicting explanations might exist, the God-symbol collapses them into a single source. “Why does the world exist?” “Why should we act morally?” “Why does this event happen?” All are answered with reference to God’s will, plan, or nature. The efficiency of this compression is immense. It enables coordination across vast populations with minimal informational overhead. But like all powerful compression, it carries the risk of overfitting. The reduced form may no longer faithfully track the complex, shifting coherence of the real.

The God-symbol’s lock-in power is amplified by its capacity to override normal justification processes. In secular symbolic regimes, actions must be justified by reference to laws, evidence, or pragmatic goals, all of which are subject to contestation. In a God-centered regime, the symbol itself becomes the warrant. To invoke God’s authority is to close the space of debate; the action is legitimate by definition. This feature has allowed the God-symbol to authorize both profound acts of compassion and catastrophic acts of violence, with the same structural mechanism at work. The key is that the symbol is positioned beyond human arbitration, making dissent not merely a political or intellectual disagreement but a metaphysical rebellion.

These features, terminality, eternity, compression, and warrant, combine to make the God-symbol self-reinforcing. Faith in God validates God’s authority, and God’s authority validates faith. This closed loop mirrors the self-referential stability of other symbolic lock-ins, but here the stakes are maximized. To abandon the symbol is not merely to reject a particular representation but to risk severing oneself from the ultimate ground of reality and morality. The psychic cost of such abandonment is therefore immense, and the social penalties in many historical contexts have been equally severe.

From the standpoint of symbolic dynamics, God represents the apex form of lock-in because it is deliberately designed to resist the very forces that normally break closure. Contradiction? Explained as a mystery beyond human understanding. Anomaly? Reinterpreted as a test of faith. Generational turnover? Mitigated by transmission through sacred texts, liturgy, and ritual. External conquest? Neutralized by absorbing the conqueror's God into the existing frame or reframing the defeat as part of divine providence. Each of these mechanisms prevents the feedback from reality that might otherwise prompt adaptation.

The danger of such a perfect attractor is not primarily that it is false. Truth and falsity in this context are not binary but dynamic, dependent on the ongoing alignment between the symbolic and the real. The danger is that its closure can make misalignment effectively irreversible. In systems without a terminal symbol, prolonged incoherence eventually produces a crisis that can lead to reconfiguration. In systems where God is the terminal symbol, the crisis may be indefinitely deferred. Not because conditions are improving, but because the symbol blocks recognition of the divergence. This deferral, paradoxically, increases the eventual severity of collapse when it comes.

Historical evidence bears this out. Theocratic empires, sacral monarchies, and religiously sanctioned legal orders have all exhibited extraordinary resilience over centuries. Yet when they fail, they often fail catastrophically, with little capacity for incremental reform. The symbolic order is so tightly coupled to the God-referent that to revise the political or social system requires revising the symbol itself. An act that, within the logic of the order, is impossible. Thus, the collapse comes not as a managed transition but as a total rupture, frequently accompanied by social disorientation, moral fragmentation, and violent contestation over new sources of legitimacy.

From a broader perspective, the God-symbol can be seen as humanity's ultimate test case in managing the tension between representation and reality. It delivers maximum stability and maximum meaning-compression, enabling high levels of coordination and shared purpose. But it also delivers maximum risk of decoupling from the adaptive flux. The closer the symbol approaches the status of an absolute, the less room there is for the feedback loops that keep representation tethered to reality. The result is a high-entropy attractor that

can persist for extraordinary lengths of time before collapsing under the weight of accumulated incoherence.

One might object that this critique confuses the symbol of God with the reality it purports to represent, that the problem lies not in God but in human interpretation. But from the standpoint of symbolic dynamics, there is no practical distinction here. All that functions in the social and cognitive system is the symbol as it is used, transmitted, and enacted. The theological claim that God transcends the symbol does not alter the structural fact that the symbol operates as the interface between the believer and the real. It is this interface, not the postulated metaphysical substrate, that shapes behavior and organizes social life.

If we frame humanity as reality in bipedal form, a living conduit through which the real becomes aware of itself, then the God-symbol represents the point at which that awareness risks closing upon itself entirely. Instead of remaining porous to the full complexity of the real, the human-symbolic system settles into a perfect self-referential loop. All novelty is either assimilated into the existing frame or rejected as error. In this sense, God as symbol is the final stage of a process that begins with the first gesture of naming, the transformation of the world into a set of representations we can manipulate. At the start, this process expands our adaptive capacity; at the end, it seals us off from the very reality we sought to master.

None of this implies that the God-symbol is dispensable without cost. Its functions, coordination, motivation, and compression, are real and powerful. The challenge is whether those functions can be preserved in forms that remain open to reality's corrective feedback. Historically, this has been attempted through theological pluralism, interpretive flexibility, and the subordination of religious authority to other forms of inquiry. But such measures are always fragile, because the structural properties of the God-symbol pull toward closure. The gravitational field of the apex attractor is difficult to resist once entered.

The larger lesson, however, extends beyond theology. God as symbol is simply the most perfected example of a dynamic that pervades all human symbolic life: *the tendency of representations to evolve toward self-reinforcing stability at the expense of adaptive coupling to the real*. The difference is that in the God-symbol, the design is explicit, and the

stakes are maximal. It is not an accidental lock-in; it is the lock-in as an ideal, the unchanging ground to which all else must conform. In that sense, the history of the God-symbol is the history of humanity's most ambitious attempt to freeze reality into a permanent form, and the repeated demonstration that reality, in the long run, cannot be frozen.

To confront the God-symbol as a lock-in attractor is not to deny the metaphysical possibility it names. It is to recognize that, as a human artifact, it shares the vulnerabilities of all symbols; the drift toward closure, the suppression of novelty, and the acceleration of entropy beneath a facade of stability. The task, if one takes the preservation of coherence as a fundamental value, is to find ways of holding even the highest symbols lightly. To keep them as living conduits rather than sealed chambers. That this is difficult, perhaps nearly impossible, does not make it less necessary. For if the symbolic is indeed reality's greatest adversary, then the apex symbol is also the apex adversary, and the struggle to keep it open is, in a sense, the struggle for the real itself.

References

James, B. (2025). *The Neurotypification of Society: Ego, Hype, and the Loss of Structural Reasoning*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTNO-8

James, B. (2025). *The Neurotypification of Society: Further Observations and Digressions*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTNO-9

James, B. (2025). *"Normal" in a Neurotypical World, or Mental Health in the Grip of the Symbolic Attractor*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMNIA

James, B. (2025). *Reality Against the Symbolic; the Structural Struggle of Humanity and Entropy*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMRAT-6

James, B. (2025). *Recursive Coherence: Foundations for an Adaptive Philosophy of Science, Mind, and Society*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMRCF